UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,158	02/29/2000	John M. Quernemoen	RA-5247	1831

		EXAMINER
7590	08/13/2003	DODDS, HAROLD E

Charles A Johnson
UNISYS Corporation
M S 4773
P O Box 64942
St Paul, MN 55164-0942

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/515,158	QUERNEMOEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Harold E. Dodds, Jr.	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 May 2003</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5-20</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____

Application/Control Number: 09/515,158

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Built In Headroom For A Preemptive Multitasking Operating System Sizer."

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

2.   The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed <u>150 words</u> in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/515,158

Art Unit: 2177

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-3 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stellwagen, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,755) and Robinson et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,263,433).

5.   Stellwagen rendered obvious independent claims 1 and 20 by the

following:

"...for the yet-to-be built database management system..." at col. 8, lines 43-45 and col.

1, lines 33-36.

"...obtaining one or more throughput workload requirements..." at col. 6, lines 1-5, col. 8,

lines 53-57, and col. 8, lines 39-43.

"...for the yet-to-be built database management system..." at col. 8, lines 43-45 and col.

1, lines 33-36.

"...and determining the hardware resources needed..." at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8,

lines 39-43.

"...for the yet-to-be built database management system..." at col. 8, lines 43-45 and col.

1, lines 33-36.

"...to satisfy the one or more throughput workload requirements..." at col. 1, lines 14-18,

col. 8, lines 53-57, and col. 8, lines 39-43.

Stellwagen does not teach the use of hardware utilization limits.

6.   However, Robinson teaches the use of hardware utilization limits as

follows:

"...providing one or more desired hardware utilization limits..." at col. 6, lines 49-51, col.

8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

"...while remaining within the desired hardware utilization limits..." at col. 6, lines 46-49,

col. 2, lines 3-8, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to

combine Robinson with Stellwagen since Stellwagen and Robinson teach the use of

computers, the use of databases, the use of networks, the use of servers, the use of

hardware, the use of software, the use of workloads, the use of requirements, the use of

hardware utilization, and the use of hardware throughputs. Stellwagen provides a

proposed database management system with throughput workload requirements and

Robinson provides for hardware utilization limits.

7.   As per claim 2, the "...accepting user entered changes...," is taught by

Stellwagen at col. 6, lines 1-5, col. 8, lines 43-45, and col. 8, lines 61-63,

the "...to the desired hardware utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson col. 8, lines 13-

16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...re-determining the required hardware resources...," is taught by Stellwagen at col.

9, lines 8-10 and col. 8, lines 39-43,

the "...needed to remain within said desired hardware utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 6, lines 46-49, col. 2, lines 3-8, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

and the "...and outputting the determined hardware resources to the human user in a format to advise the human user...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 63-65, col 9, lines 8-10, col. 8, lines 39-43, and col. 1, lines 44-49.

8.   As per claim 3, the "...obtaining selected database requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 7, lines 48-51, col. 2, lines 55-57, and col. 8, lines 39-43, the "...including expected database size...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 45-48 and col. 2, lines 55-57,

the "...and determining the hardware resources needed ...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 9, lines 8-10 and col. 8, lines 39-43,

the "...for the yet-to-be built database management system...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 43-45 and col. 1,

the "...to satisfy the selected database requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 1, lines 14-18, lines 33-36, col. 7, lines 48-51, col. 2, lines 55-57, and col. 8, lines 39-43, and the "...while remaining within the desired hardware utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 6, lines 46-49, col. 2, lines 3-8, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

9.   Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stellwagen and Robinson as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Yang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,864).

Application/Control Number: 09/515,158

Art Unit: 2177

As per claim 5, the "...one or more throughput workload requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 53-57 and col. 8, lines 39-43, but the "...includes a transactions per second requirement...," is not taught by either Stillwagen or Robinson.

However, Yang teaches the use of transactions per second requirements as follows:

"...transaction_rate /* Transaction rate in transactions per second */..." at col. 30, line 28.

"...These calculated response times are compared against the required response times (where specified) to determine if a system configuration is acceptable..." at col. 32, lines 62-65.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine Yang with Stellwagen and Robinson since Stellwagen, Robinson, and Yang teach the use of computers, the use of databases, the use of networks, the use of servers, the use of hardware, the use of software, the use of workloads, the use of requirements, the use of hardware utilization, and the use of hardware throughputs and Stellwagen and Yang teach the use of clients and the use of the SQL query language. Stellwagen provides a proposed database management system with throughput workload requirements, Robinson provides for hardware utilization limits, and Yang provides a means of defining the transactions rate.

10. As per claim 6, the "...determining and re-determining steps include determining the hardware resources needed...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8, lines 39-43

Application/Control Number: 09/515,158
Art Unit: 2177

and the "...as a function of the transactions per second requirement...," is taught by

Yang at col. 7, lines 1-2, col. 30, line 28, and col. 32, lines 62-65.

11.   As per claim 7, the "...hardware resources...," is taught by Stellwagen at

col. 8, lines 39-43

and the "...include a number of processors...," is taught by Yang at col. 29, lines 58-59.

12.   As per claim 8, the "...determining and re-determining steps include

determining said number of processors...," is taught by Yang at col. 5, lines 3-5 and col.

29, line 46

and the "...as a function of the transactions per second requirement...," is taught by

Yang at col. 7, lines 1-2, col. 30, line 28, and col. 32, lines 62-65.

13.   As per claim 9, the "...desired hardware utilization limits...," is taught by

Robinson col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...include a desired percent processor utilization...," is taught by Yang at col. 14,

lines 9-12 and col. 5, lines 3-5,

the "...and said accepting step includes accepting changes...," is taught by Stellwagen

at col. 6, lines 1-5, col. 8, lines 43-45, and col. 8, lines 61-63,

the "...to said desired percent processor utilization...," is taught by Yang at col. 14, lines

9-12 and col. 5, lines 3-5,

the "...and said determining and re-determining steps includes determining said

hardware resources...," is taught by Stelwagon at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8, lines 39-

43,

the "...such that said desired percent processor utilization...," is taught by Yang at col. 14, lines 9-12, and col. 5, lines 3-5,

the "...processor utilization limits is maintained...," is taught by Robinson at col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 6, lines 39-41,

the "...and includes changing said number of processors required when necessary...," is taught by Yang at col. 16, lines 4-8, col. 29, line 46, and col. 1, lines 13-20,

and the "...to remain within said desired processor utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 6, lines 46-49, col. 2, lines 3-8, col. 3, lines 16-23, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

14.   Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stellwagen, Robinson, and Yang as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,231).

As per claim 10, the "...said desired processor utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...and said determining and re-determining steps include determining said number of processors...," is taught by Yang at col. 5, lines 3-5 and col. 29, line 46,

but the "...include upper an utilization limits...,"

the "...to prevent over utilization of said processors...,"

the "...needed to keeping below said upper limit...,"

and the "...to prevent over utilization of said processors...," are not taught by either Stellwagen, Robinson, or Yang.

However, Miller teaches the use of upper utilization limits as follows:

"...If the sampling rate could be reduced sufficiently to allow construction of a block receiver to form telephony baseband signals, then efficiencies in terms of processing speed and hardware utilization requirements could be achieved..." at page 6, lines 18-23.

"...Thus, b is preferably limited by upper and lower bounds..." at col. 45, lines 57-58.

"...Larger spectral processing blocks would prevent utilization of smaller blocks sandwiched between large ingress tones..." at col. 29, lines 18-20.

"...As fiber is moved more deeply into the serving areas in fiber/coax and FTSA configurations, the bandwidth of the coax portion is expected to increase to over 1 GHz..." at col. 2, lines 47-50.

"...With sampling frequency at the required rate under the Nyquist theorem, separate filters and FFT processors are required order to perform at speeds acceptable for telephony applications, which involve large numbers of channels..." at col. 6, lines 6-10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine Miller with Stellwagen, Robinson, and Yang since Stellwagen, Robinson, Yang, and Miller teach the use of computers, the use of databases, the use of networks, the use of hardware, the use of software, the use of workloads, the use of requirements, and the use of hardware utilization. Stellwagen provides a proposed database management system with throughput workload requirements, Robinson provides for hardware utilization limits, Yang provides a means of defining the processor requirements, and Miller provides the concept of upper and lower utilization limits.

15.   As per claim 11, the "...said desired percent processor utilization...," is taught by Yang at col. 14, lines 9-12 and col. 5, lines 3-5,

the "...processor utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 8,

lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...includes a lower utilization limits...," is taught by Miller at col. 7, lines 42-44-, col.

6, lines 18-23, and col. 30, lines 10-14,

and the "...to prevent under utilization of said processors...," is taught by Miller at col.

29, lines 18-20, col. 30, lines 40-42, and col. 6, lines 6-10.

16.   As per claim 12, the "...said determining, and re-determining steps include

said number of processors needed...," is taught by Yang at col. 5, lines 3-5 and col. 29,

line 46,

the "...to remain keeping above said lower limit...," is taught by Miller at col. 12, lines 62-

66 and col. 45, lines 57-58,

and the "...to prevent under utilization of said processors...;" is taught by Miller at col.

29, lines 18-20, col. 30, lines 40-42, and col. 6, lines 6-10.

17.   As per claim 13, the "...said desired hardware utilization limits...," is taught

by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...include a desired network interface card...," is taught by Yang at col. 14, lines 9-

12 and col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...utilization limit...;" is taught by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-

19,

the "...and said determining and re-determining steps include determining said hardware

requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8, lines 39-43,

the "...within said desired network interface card...," is taught by Yang at col. 28, lines 39-40 and col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...and includes changing said number of network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 45, lines 35-36 col. 17, lines 39-44, and col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...required when necessary to remain within said network interface card...," is taught by Yang at col. 28, lines 39-40 and col. 35, lines 62-65,

and the "...utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-19,

18.   As per claim 14, the "...said network interface card...," is taught by Yang at col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...includes a lower utilization limits...," is taught by Miller at col. 45, lines 57-58, col. 6, lines 18-23, and col. 30, lines 10-14,

the "...to prevent under utilization...," is taught by Miller at col. 30, lines 40-42 and col. 39, lines 18-20,

the "...of said network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...and said determining and re-determining steps include determining said number of network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 45, lines 35-36 col. 17, lines 39-44, and col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...needed to remain keeping above said lower limit...," is taught by Miller at col. 16, lines 62-66 and col. 45, lines 57-58,

the "...to prevent under utilization...," is taught by Miller at col. 30, lines 40-42 and col. 39, lines 18-20,

and the "...of said network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 45, lines 35-36 col. 17, lines 39-44, and col. 35, lines 62-65.

19.   As per claim 15, the "...said network interface card...," is taught by Yang at col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 8, lines 13-16 and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...includes an upper utilization limits...," is taught by Miller at col. 45, lines 57-58, col. 6, lines 18-23, and col. 30, lines 10-14,

the "...to prevent over utilization...," is taught by Miller at col. 2, lines 47-50 and col. 29. lines 18-20,

the "...of said network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...and said determining and re-determining steps include determining said number of network interface cards needed ...," is taught by Yang at col. 45, lines 35-36 col. 17, lines 39-44, and col. 35, lines 62-65,

the "...remain keeping below said upper limit...," is taught by Miller at col. 30, lines 40-42 and col. 45, lines 57-78,

the "...to prevent over utilization...," is taught by Miller at col. 2, lines 47-50 and col. 29. lines 18-20,

and the "...of said network interface cards...," is taught by Yang at col. 35, lines 62-65.

20.   Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stellwagen, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,755), Robinson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,433), and Yang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,864).

21.   Stellwagen rendered obvious independent claim 16 by the following:

"...obtaining a workload requirement from said human user..." at col. 6, lines 1-5, col. 8, lines 53-57, col. 8, lines 39-43, and col. 8, lines 45-48.

"...and determining said hardware resource requirements..." at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8, lines 39-43.

"...as a function of said workload requirement..." at col. 8, lines 4-5, col. 8, lines 53-57, and col. 8, lines 37-43.

Stellwagen does not teach the use of hardware utilization limits and the use of default values.

22.   However, Robinson teaches the use of hardware utilization limits as follows:

"...for selected hardware utilization limits..." at col. 2, lines 56-58, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

"...initializing said selected hardware utilization limits..." at col. 2, lines 53-58, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

"...while remaining within said selected hardware utilization limits..." at col. 2, lines 3-7, col. 2, lines 56-58, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine Robinson with Stellwagen since Stellwagen and Robinson teach the use of computers, the use of databases, the use of networks, the use of servers, the use of hardware, the use of software, the use of workloads, the use of requirements, the use of hardware utilization, and the use of hardware throughputs. Stellwagen provides a proposed database management system with workload requirements and Robinson provides for hardware utilization limits.

Robinson does not teach the use of default values.

23.   However, Yang teaches the use of default values as follows:

"...establishing default values..." at col. 19, lines 41-42.

"...to said default values..." at col. 19, lines 41-42.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine Yang with Stellwagen and Robinson since Stellwagen, Robinson, and Yang teach the use of computers, the use of databases, the use of networks, the use of servers, the use of hardware, the use of software, the use of workloads, the use of requirements, the use of hardware utilization, and the use of hardware throughputs and Stellwagen and Yang teach the use of clients and the use of the SQL query language. Stellwagen provides a proposed database management system with workload requirements, Robinson provides for hardware utilization limits, and Yang provides for default values for initializing the hardware utilization limits.

24.   As per claim 17, the "...obtaining new hardware utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 2, lines 11-16, col. 7, lines 52-55, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...from said human user...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 45-48,

the "...re-determining said hardware resource requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 57-61 and col. 8, lines 39-43,

the "...while remaining within said hardware utilization limits...," is taught by Robinson at col. 2, lines 3-7, col. 2, lines 56-58, col. 8, lines 13-16, and col. 5, lines 16-19,

the "...and displaying the determined hardware resource requirements in a format...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 63-65, col. 8, lines 57-61, and col. 8, lines 39-43,

the "...to advise the user of the hardware resource requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 1, lines 44-49,

the "...for a yet-to-be built database management system computer...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 43-45, col. 1, lines 33-38,

and the "...to meet the user entered workload requirement...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 45-58, col. 8, lines 53-57, and col. 8, lines 39-43.

25.   As per claim 18, the "...said hardware resource requirements...," is taught by Stellwagen at col. 8, lines 39-43

and the "...include a specified discrete numbers of hardware components...," is taught by Yang at col. 9, lines 63-67, col. 25, line 19, and col. 26, lines 13-14.

26.   As per claim 19, the "...said determining and re-determining steps include

determining said specified number of hardware components....," is taught by Yang col.

5, lines 3-8, col. 25, line 19, and col. 26, lines 13-14.

Response to Arguments

27.   Applicants' arguments filed 19 May 2003 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive. In the first argument for claims 1-3 and 5-19 on page 8

paragraph 2, the applicants state as follows:

"During the interview, the Examiner and the Primary Examiner appeared to
acknowledge that the previous rejections were likely improper because they were
based, at least in part, on non-analogous art."

In response to applicant's argument that the art used in the Final Rejection mailed on 16

December 2002 is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must

either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to

the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied

upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443,

24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references used contained many

elements in common and contained all of the elements, which were critical to the

proposed invention. Furthermore, the references used in the Final Rejection have been

replaced by four new references. The new Stellwagen and Yang references use

analogous art and are clearly analogous to the proposed invention. The new Robinson

and Miller references addressed hardware utilization limits and used many of the same

elements in common with Stellwagen and Yang as well as the proposed invention.

Conclusion

28.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harold E. Dodds, Jr. whose telephone number is (703)-305-1802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (703)-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Harold E. Dodds, Jr.
Patent Examiner
August 11, 2003

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER